#### ILLINOIS POWER COMPANY

# PREPARED SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF

# JACQUELINE K. VOILES

### **SEPTEMBER 22, 2000**

			DOCKET NOS. 00-0259, 00-0395, 00-0461 (CONS.)
			DOCKET NOS. 00-0259, 00-0395, 00-0461 (CONS.)  PREPARED SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF  JACQUELINE K. VOILES  SEPTEMBER 22, 2000  I. WITNESS INTRODUCTION
			JACQUELINE K. VOILES
			SEPTEMBER 22, 2000
1			I. <u>WITNESS INTRODUCTION</u>
2	1.	Q.	Please state your name, business address and present position.
3		A.	Jacqueline K. Voiles, 500 South 27th Street, Decatur, Illinois 62521. I am the
4			Manager of Delivery Services in the Business Development Services Department of
5			Illinois Power Company ("Illinois Power", "IP" or "Company").
6	2.	Q.	Have you previously submitted testimony and exhibits in this proceeding?
7		A.	Yes, on July 7, 2000, I submitted prepared direct testimony and exhibits identified
8			as IP Exhibits 3.1 through 3.5 and on September 12, 2000, I submitted prepared
9		•	rebuttal testimony identified as IP Exhibit 3.6.
10	3.	Q.	What additional evidence are you presenting at this time?
11		A.	I am presenting surrebuttal testimony identified as IP Exhibit 3.7.
12			II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY
13	4.	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
14		A.	I am responding to the rebuttal testimony filed September 12, 2000 by Philip R.
15			O'Connor and Tom Bramschreiber on behalf of NewEnergy Midwest, L.L.C. The
16			portions of the testimony of these witnesses to which I am responding deal with
17			Illinois Power's Transition Charges ("TC") and Power Purchase Option Service
18			("PPO").

19

~	,	٠,	
4	1	J	

#### III. PRICE SHAPING / LOAD SHAPING

Q. 21 5. Do you agree with Mr. O'Connor's and Mr. Bramschreiber's position that IP should 22 be required to change its methodology for applying the PJM adjustment to not only 23 the on-peak prices but also the off-peak prices in order to be consistent with ComEd 24 and Ameren? 25 A. No, I do not agree. Illinois Power differs from ComEd and Ameren in the application 26 of the market values used to calculate customer PPO bills. Therefore, even if IP were 27 to adopt the PJM adjustment for off-peak prices, differences would still exist between 28 the utilities. As referenced in my rebuttal testimony, the recommendation to change 29 the methodology for applying the PJM adjustment to both the on-peak and off-peak 30 values for Illinois Power is not acceptable for Illinois Power's situation. Illinois 31 Power uses the PJM shaped prices to not only calculate customer TC amounts but 32 also to calculate customer bills under Rider PPO. This is an entirely different 33 situation than for ComEd and Ameren. 34 6. Q. What is the importance of matching the market values used in calculating customer 35 TC's and PPO bills? 36 A. Illinois Power calculates customer specific transition charges for customers with 37 demands of 100 kW or greater. For these customers, using the same market values 38 when calculating their TC and their PPO bills insures that the savings a customer 39 expects are realized. Also, this methodology would seem to be in compliance with 40 Section 16-110(b) of the Electric Service Customer Choice and Rate Relief Law of 41 1997 which states, in essence, that the market values used for PPO bills are the

Page 3 of 4 values the electric utility uses to calculate the customer's transition charges. (I leave 42 43 to the legal briefing stage any statutory interpretation questions). If Illinois Power were to adopt the PJM adjustment for the on-peak and off-peak 7. Q. 44 values and thereby have 8760 values to calculate customer TC's and PPO bills, what 45 issues become evident? 46 From a customer perspective, using 8,760 hourly market values would create a 47 A. monthly PPO bill containing approximately 730 hours of market values multiplied 48 49 by the applicable hourly usage. The increased complexity of PPO bills would not warrant the additional perceived value. The volatility of off-peak prices is not 50 substantial, as referenced by Messrs. Jones and Peters in their rebuttal testimony, as 51 compared to the on-peak prices which require, rightfully so, the application of the 52 PJM adjustment. Also, the amount of rework of Company programs is substantial 53 in light of the perceived customer benefits. 54 55 IV. PPO ISSUES Do you agree with New Energy's position that at a minimum, imbalance costs should 8. Q. 56 be included on PPO customers' invoices as part of the transmission and transmission 57 ancillary services line item charge? 58 In Docket Nos. 99-0120/99-0134, IP specifically applied for the direct pass through A. 59 of imbalance charges within its Rider PPO. The order in that case, however, did not 60 allow IP to pass these costs along to its PPO customers. NewEnergy's suggestion 61 that IP is consciously underpricing PPO service to the detriment of alternative supply 62 is inaccurate since IP is following the Commission's approved tariffs.

63

64

- 65 9. Q. Does this conclude your prepared surrebuttal testimony?
- A. Yes, it does.